



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/587,824

09/14/2006

Jichu Yang

039050/314704

2294

826

7590

04/11/2008

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/587,824	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Taufiq A. Solola	<b>Art Unit</b> 1625	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 9–10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. Under US patent practice, a use claim without setting forth the steps involved in the process is an improper definition of a process, under 35 U.S.C. See *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd. App, 1967) and *Clin. Products v. Brenner*, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C., 1966). By deleting the claim the rejection would be overcome.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims lack adequate support in the specification. The term “hypertension related diseases” is not defined in the specification so as to ascertain intends to claim. It is not clear in claim 10 if the listed diseases define hypertension related diseases or hypertension. In patent examination, it is essential for claims to be precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989). By deleting the claims the rejection would be overcome.

Art Unit: 1625

The requirement of 35 USC 112, is not what is known or obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art but a “full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same”, *Lookwood v. American Airlines Inc.* 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed Cir. 1997). See also the status above.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7, 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For the reasons set forth above under 35 USC 112, first paragraph claims 9-10 are indefinite. See the Examiner's suggestions above.

The phrase “deriving the compound monomer by . . . condition” in claim 7, is confusing, and therefore the claim is indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 4 improperly depends from claim 2 for failure to limit the scope of claim 2. The claims are drawn to the same agent (composition). Claim 4 cites intended uses. Under the US patent practice intended use is not a limitation of a compound or product. *In re Hack*, 114USPQ 161 (CCPA, 1957); *In re Craig*, 90 USPQ 33 (CCPA, 1951); *In re Brenner*, 82 USPQ 49 (CCPA, 1949). By deleting the claim the rejection would be overcome.

Art Unit: 1625

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Varfalvi et al., HU 44495 A2.

Varfalvi et al., disclose compounds and compositions thereof in the attached abstract.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carling et al., US 5,939,436.

Carling et al., disclose 4-hydroxypiperidine. See example 1.

According to the ISR and Written Opinion of PCT/CN2004/001125, claims 1, 6, 8 are not patentable over CN1261363A and CN1363297A. However, the Office will revisit this rejection when English translated copies are filed. The full documents, in English or otherwise, are not currently filed as well as the ISR. This is a requirement under the US patent practice. Applicant should note that WIPO does not make copies of references or English translations available to Examination Authorities. Therefore, English translated copies the CN references listed on the ISR must be filed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 1625

a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over above prior arts.

Applicant claims compounds of formula I and composition thereof. In preferred embodiment the composition is dosage forms.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)

Varfalvi et al., disclose compounds and compositions thereof in the attached abstract.

Carling et al., disclose 4-hydroxypiperidine. See example 1.

According to the ISR and Written Opinion of PCT/CN2004/001125, claim 1, is not patentable over CN1261363A. The prior art discloses 4-piperidine.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP 2141.02)

The difference between the instant invention and that of the prior arts is that at positions R1 and R2, applicant claims methyl instead of H by the prior arts. Also, compound II of Varfalvi et al., is 2° amine instead of 3° amine by applicant.

Finding of prima facie obviousness---rational and motivation (MPEP 2142.2413)

However, 2° and 3° amines are obvious variants. *Ex parte Bluestone*, 135 USPQ 199 (1961). Also, H and alkyl are art recognized equivalents. *In re Lincoln*, 126 USPQ 477, 53 USPQ 40 (CCPA, 1942); *In re Druey*, 319 F.2d 237, 138 USPQ 39 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Lohr*, 317 F.2d 388, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Hoehsema*, 399 F.2d 269, 158 USPQ 598 (CCPA, 1968); *In re Wood*, 582 F.2d 638, 199 USPQ 137 (CCPA, 1978); *In re Hoke*, 560 F.2d 436, 195 USPQ 148 (CCPA, 1977); *Ex parte Fauque*, 121 USPQ 425 (POBA, 1954); *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474, (POBA, 1960).

Further, determining the dose of an active compound is well known in the practice of medicine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to make all the changes to the

Art Unit: 1625

compounds of the prior arts and determine the dose at the time the invention was made. The motivation is from knowing that H and alkyl are equivalents, that 2° and 3° amines are obvious variants and from the common practice in medicine.

***Telephone Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/Taofiq A. Solola/

Primary Examiner, 1625

March 26, 2008